

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, and 16 have been amended to clarify what Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 8-10 have been amended to change claim dependencies in these claims. No new matter has been added.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 has been amended to remove any such alleged indefiniteness in these claims. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim rejections under § 112 have been overcome.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER U.S.C. § 102/103

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16-18, 21, 24, 25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,540,681 (Strul). Claims 1-5, 11, 12, 14, 16-21, 24, 25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,772,659 (Becker). Applicant respectfully notes that in order to sustain a rejection under §102, each element in the rejected claim must be found, either expressly or inherently, in the cited reference.

Amended claim 1 recites a power regulation circuit configured for compensating a power change along the patient cable by controlling the output power based at least in part on the feedback signal. Amended claim 16 recites a similar limitation. Strul does not disclose or suggest such limitation. Rather, Strul discloses a catheter 12 carrying a temperature sensor 30 at its distal end for sensing a temperature of an electrode 28 (Column 5, lines 22-40; Figure 3). There is nothing in Strul

that discloses or suggests a circuit configured to compensate a power change along a cable. As such, claims 1 and 16 are believed allowable over Strul. For at least the same reason that claims 1 and 16 are allowable over Strul, claims 2-15, which depend from claim 1, and claims 17-28, which depend from claim 16, are also believed allowable over Strul.

Becker also does not disclose or suggest the above claim limitation. Rather, Becker discloses a power control circuit 107 having a current sampling circuit 115 that is coupled to an output electrode. The current sampling circuit is configured to sense an average current flowing from a generator 101, through the output electrode and an impedance load 121, and returning to the generator through another electrode (Column 5, lines 37-50; Figure 1). There is nothing in Becker that discloses or suggests a circuit configured for compensating a power change along a cable. As such, claims 1 and 16 are believed allowable over Becker. For at least the same reason that claims 1 and 16 are allowable over Becker, claims 2-15, which depend from claim 1, and claims 17-28, which depend from claim 16, are also believed allowable over Becker.

Applicant further submits that claims 6 and 20 are allowable over Strul, Becker, and their combination for at least the reason that neither Strul, Becker, or their combination discloses or suggests a power sensor. As discussed previously, Strul only discloses a temperature sensor, and Becker discloses a circuit for sensing a current. There is nothing in Strul, Becker, or their combination that discloses or suggests a power sensor (as recited in claim 6) or sensing a delivered power near a distal end of a patient cable (as recited in claim 20). For the foregoing reasons, claims 6 and 20 are believed allowable over Strul, Becker, and their combination.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all remaining claims are believed in condition for allowance. If, the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, please contact the undersigned at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: 8/19/03

By: 
Gerald Chan
Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
(650) 849-4960